

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Redeemer University affirms that all members of the university community are obliged to maintain the highest standards of academic integrity. All students, staff, faculty, and administrators at Redeemer University are responsible for creating and maintaining an environment where academic integrity flourishes in all areas of academic life, including instruction, learning, research, and administration. This is an integral part of our mandate to perform scholarly work under the Lordship of Jesus Christ and to serve Him.

The faculty and staff of Redeemer University believe that breaches of academic integrity significantly undermine the university's ability to fairly evaluate students and, as such, consider breaches of academic integrity to be unacceptable and counter to the learning objectives of the university.

For this reason, Redeemer University has a Policy on Academic Integrity; the following is a summary of that policy and the procedures in place for handling possible cases of academic dishonesty. The full version of the policy and procedures for (1) handling cases of possible academic integrity and (2) dealing with student appeals of academic-integrity decisions or sanctions, can be found on the App for the internal Redeemer community (at [this link](#)).

Definitions:

“Academic dishonesty”: a violation of one of the types listed below is considered a case, or instance, of academic dishonesty.

“Violation”: short for a “violation of the academic integrity policy”, a “violation” is a synonym for a case of academic dishonesty.

Responsibilities:

Students: Students must take responsibility for their own academic work, adhering to integrity standards for themselves but also encouraging and cultivating a culture of integrity among their classmates. Students are responsible for being familiar with, and avoiding, the academic integrity violations described below in “Types of Academic Violations”.

Faculty: Faculty are responsible for ensuring that expectations with respect to academic integrity are clearly communicated to students through mention of this policy in course syllabi, and, particularly in select first-year courses, the inclusion of specific mention and training on academic integrity.

Some programs and/or instructors may have specific rules designed to maintain academic integrity that build on (but do not contradict) this policy and its related procedures; if so, these are to be clearly communicated to students through course syllabi or other appropriate methods.

Types of Academic Violations

- 1. Cheating on any kind of test.** Cheating involves using, or attempting to use, unauthorized materials during a quiz, test, or exam. This includes looking at the work of students near you during testing.
- 2. Altering a returned assignment and then asking that it be re-graded.** If you receive an assignment back, alter the work and then ask the instructor to check the grading so that you can get a better grade, it is a violation of academic integrity.
- 3. Plagiarizing.** Plagiarism is the submission of material that has been, entirely or in part, copied from, stolen from, purchased from, written by, created by, designed by, or produced by (an)other person(s) without

proper acknowledgement. Plagiarism is also the submission of material developed by generative Artificial Intelligence (A.I.) software (e.g., ChatGPT) outside of instructor-sanctioned use. When students directly quote or use material from a particular source (including generative A.I. software, when permitted), or when they use material indirectly (i.e., they are expressing in their own words a concept, idea, or interpretation that they have obtained from another source), they are required to provide a reference or footnote to give credit to the original source of the material. Failure to do so constitutes plagiarism, as does neglecting to use quotation marks around direct quotations, even if a citation is provided.

The following points further clarify the issue:

- The offense could stem from a deliberate attempt to deceive, which is particularly serious, or from careless scholarship, which is less serious, but still plagiarism.
- Plagiarism applies not only to written texts but also to images, videos, music, and any other multimedia elements used without properly crediting the source.
- Copying and submitting a classmate's homework or homework completed by a student who took the course before also constitutes plagiarism.

Given the complexity in this type of academic integrity violation, the [tables below](#) have been drawn up to provide additional clarity on how possible violations of this type will be considered and handled as a part of the processes to determine if a violation has occurred and how sanctions for violations will be handled.

For group assignments, all group members are responsible for ensuring that their submission does not contain plagiarism. If plagiarism is found, the breach of academic integrity will apply to all group members, though the specific penalties may vary.

- 4. Self-plagiarizing.** Students can revisit topics, analytical approaches, and/or conceptual frameworks as they progress through their academic program. If a student submits an assignment (in whole or part), however, that they had previously submitted for marks in an earlier course, this constitutes self-plagiarism unless they have received prior permission from the instructor in the second course who deemed it acceptable for credit.
- 5. Sharing confidential or restricted assignment material.** This violation refers to obtaining, distributing, and/or receiving copies of a quiz, test, or examination before the quiz, test, or examination is to be written, without the consent of the instructor. It also refers to releasing information about the content of a quiz, test, or examination, in the case where one is permitted to write it before the rest of the class.
- 6. Lying to gain advantage.** Examples of this include, but may not be limited to, providing false information that results in obtaining alternate quiz/test/examination dates or extensions.
- 7. Helping another student cheat.** Whether in the same course as the student or outside the course, this violation is also known as aiding and abetting another student's misconduct. This violation includes the following:
 - Allowing one's quiz, test, examination, assignment, computer program, artwork, etc., to be copied.
 - Offering one's (paid or unpaid) services to write or rewrite academic material to be submitted under the name of another student.
 - Impersonating another student at a quiz, test, or exam.
 - Forging the signature of another student on attendance sheets or other formal academic documents.

8. Providing false information or documents. Examples of this type of violation includes, but may not be limited to:

- Providing false information while gaining admission to Redeemer University, gaining transfer credits, etc.
- Falsifying, misrepresenting, or forging an academic record, letter of reference, or any official university document.

Processes for investigating suspected cases of academic dishonesty

Plagiarism Cases

1. In suspected cases of plagiarism not involving the non-sanctioned use of generative A.I. software or copying the work of other students, the course instructor will be guided by the following [tables](#) to determine if a particular instance is, is not, or should be forwarded to a faculty adjudicator to determine if it is a case of plagiarism.
 - 1.1. The tables distinguish between “careless scholarship,” “problematic scholarship” – which *may* be considered plagiarism – and true “plagiarism”, based on the missing and present aspects required for good scholarship and presentation of cited works.
 - 1.2. *Careless scholarship* is not considered academic dishonesty but should be addressed using grade reductions on the assignment, with such careless scholarship having a larger impact on the assignment grade as the year level increases. Careless scholarship will not be recorded in any special manner beyond the specific course in which it occurred.
 - 1.3. *Problematic scholarship* is more serious and will normally be treated as a formal academic dishonesty case.
 - 1.3.1. Exception: If a student has no record of any previous academic dishonesty cases (of any kind, not just of plagiarism) nor previous instances of problematic scholarship, their first problematic-scholarship case will be considered a formal warning. The instance will be formally recorded and remedial action (such as rewriting the offending assignment, (re-) taking specific courses/modules on correct citation, etc.) may be prescribed. Should the student not complete any required remedial action in the prescribed time, the instance will be elevated to a formal violation and treated as such.
 - 1.4. *Plagiarism* is a case of academic dishonesty and treated as such.
2. [Table 2](#) distinguishes between “occasional” and “significant” instances of missing citations for paraphrasing or summarizing other sources; such determinations will require that the case follow the [General Process](#) for suspected academic dishonesty cases below. Similarly, cases of suspected plagiarism involving copying other students’ work or the non-sanctioned use of generative A.I. software must also follow that same [General Process](#).

Table 1: Direct Quotations in an Essay or Report (X = missing; ✓= present/okay)

Quotation Marks	Citation	Bibliography Information	Assessment	Action
✓	X	✓	"Careless scholarship" Not an AIP violation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor reduces grade¹ • No institutional record kept
✓	✓	X		
✓	X	X		
X	✓	✓	"Problematic scholarship" AIP violation, except AIP warning if first violation	<p><i>(No adjudicator involvement)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Registrar keeps record of violation • Remedial T&L action • AIP violation with standard penalty applying UNLESS student has no prior AIP violations (including "problematic scholarship" violations). In that case: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instructor reduces grade¹ ○ Student receives formal warning ○ Warning becomes an AIP violation with standard penalty applying if any assigned remedial action does not occur
X	✓	X		
X	X	✓	"Plagiarism" AIP violation	<p><i>(No adjudicator involvement)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard penalty applies • Registrar keeps record of violation
X	X	X		

¹ Grade-reduction penalties assigned by instructors when no official violation is recorded should be reflective of the grade level of the course, with larger grade reductions for careless or problematic scholarship given in higher-level courses.

Table 2: Summarizing or Paraphrasing Sources in an Essay or Report (X = missing; ✓= present/okay)

Quotation Marks	Citation	Bibliography Information	Assessment	Action
n/a	X, <i>occasional instances</i>	✓	Careless scholarship Not an AIP violation	<p><i>Adjudicator involved to determine if case is “careless” or “problematic”</i></p> <p>If careless:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instructor reduces grade¹ • No institutional record kept <p>If problematic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow same process as for “Cited Mosaic Plagiarism”, below
n/a	X, <i>significant number of instances for length of document</i>	✓	Problematic scholarship AIP violation, except AIP warning if first violation	
X, <i>but paraphrase is so close to original text that direct quotes would have been preferable</i>	✓	✓	Problematic scholarship (Cited “ Mosaic Plagiarism ”) AIP violation, except AIP warning if first violation	<p><i>(No adjudicator involvement)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Registrar keeps record of violation • AIP violation with standard penalty applying UNLESS student has no prior AIP violations (including “problematic scholarship” violations). In that case: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instructor reduces grade¹ ○ Student receives formal warning ○ Warning becomes an AIP violation with standard penalty applying if any assigned remedial action does not occur
X, <i>but paraphrase is so close to original text that direct quotes would have been preferable</i>	X	✓	(Uncited Mosaic Plagiarism) AIP violation	<p><i>(No adjudicator involvement)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard penalty applies • Registrar keeps record of violation
n/a	X	X	Plagiarism AIP violation	

¹ Grade-reduction penalties assigned by instructors when no official violation is recorded should be reflective of the grade level of the course, with larger grade reductions for careless or problematic scholarship given in higher-level courses.

3. Except those cases specifically mentioned in Point 2 above, plagiarism cases follow a simplified process, given here:
 - 3.1. The instructor will inform the Registrar of the case, including relevant documentation.
 - 3.2. The Registrar will check the student's record to determine next steps.
 - 3.2.1. If the case is one of problematic scholarship and the student has no prior record of problematic scholarship or academic dishonesty, the Registrar will inform the instructor to that effect and include any University-prescribed remedial actions for the student to complete. The instructor may then proceed with the meeting outlined in 3.3 based on the information the Registrar provided (as to whether the case will be considered a formal academic dishonesty case or a warning for a first instance of problematic scholarship).
 - 3.2.2. If the case is one of academic dishonesty, the Registrar will inform the chair of the Academic Standards Committee (the "Chair") and determine the correct sanction based on the particulars of the case and the student's academic dishonesty history.
 - 3.3. The instructor will meet in person (or virtually if an in-person meeting is not practical) with the student to discuss the student's submission and how it has been determined to be a case of problematic scholarship or plagiarism.
 - 3.3.1. If the case was discovered in the final week of classes or during final exams, the meeting may be arranged for after the student's final exam is completed. In the rare case in which a meeting cannot be arranged to occur within two weeks of the instructor's discovery of the case, the instructor may communicate by email to the student's Redeemer email address.
 - 3.3.2. The meeting must include a review of the particulars of the case.
 - 3.3.2.1. If the case is one of problematic scholarship and the student has no prior record, the instructor shall also provide the student with the required remedial actions to perform, along with a deadline for completing those actions – normally not less than two weeks and not longer than one month. The remedial action must include a resubmission of the offending assignment.
 - 3.3.2.2. If the case is one of academic dishonesty, the instructor must inform the student that a letter will be arriving from the Chair outlining the formal sanction for the offense and the student's option and process for appealing the decision and/or the sanction.
 - 3.4. In cases of academic dishonesty, after the instructor has met with the student, the Chair will send a letter to the student by way of their official Redeemer email with information about the violation, any sanction that affects the student's grade on the particular assignment or overall course, and the options and deadlines for appeal. In cases of a student committing near-simultaneous violations of the same type in separate courses, the Chair will determine whether the violations should be counted as a single or separate violations, in line with Policy Section 3.4.
 - 3.5. In cases of first-time problematic scholarship, the student must provide the instructor with evidence that the remedial action(s) have been satisfactorily completed by the prescribed deadline. If that action is not completed, the instructor informs the Registrar, who then updates the student's record to reflect that the case is now one of academic dishonesty, and communicates with the Chair to determine the appropriate sanction. With the case now being considered academic dishonesty, the step immediately above (Step 3.4) is then followed.

General Process

1. For all suspected cases of academic dishonesty not falling under the process given above for plagiarism, the instructor will meet in person (or virtually if an in-person meeting is not practical) with the student to discuss the case.

- 1.1. If the case was discovered in the final week of classes or during final exams, the meeting may be arranged for after the student's final exam is completed. In the rare case in which a meeting cannot be arranged to occur within two weeks of the instructor's discovery of the case, the instructor may communicate by email to the student's Redeemer email address.
- 1.2. The meeting must include a review of the particulars of the case and the student may provide information that allows the instructor to determine that the case is not a violation, ending the process.
- 1.3. If the instructor continues to suspect that there was a violation, the instructor must inform the student that the matter is being forwarded to a faculty adjudicator and that the student should expect to hear from that person in due course. The process continues at Step 2.
- 1.4. Should the student confess to a violation, the faculty member will include that confession in their documentation of the case and the process continues at Step 4 with the faculty member communicating directly with the Registrar in place of the faculty adjudicator.
2. The instructor then refers the case to the relevant faculty adjudicator, providing all documentation and context they believe relevant.
3. The faculty adjudicator determines whether there has been a violation. In making this determination, the adjudicator may obtain information from any person involved, but the adjudicator's investigation must not take longer than two weeks unless the adjudicator notifies the Chair and the student of the reasons for the delay. When the adjudicator asks to meet with the student, the student must be informed that they may bring another person with them to the meeting.
 - 3.1. If the faculty adjudicator determines that there has not been a violation, that determination is shared with the student and the instructor, the matter is officially dropped and the process ends.
 - 3.2. If the faculty adjudicator determines that there has been a violation, the adjudicator informally notifies the Chair, who may share information about similar violations and the resulting sanctions applied. The adjudicator then formally notifies the Chair with a report that includes the nature of the violation and a recommendation of an appropriate penalty based on precedent (if any) and the assumption that the violation was the student's first.
 - 3.2.1. If, during the investigation, the student already disclosed to the adjudicator that this violation would not be their first, the adjudicator does not need to make a sanction recommendation.
4. The Chair receives the report and confers with the Registrar to determine how many prior violations the student has on record and then decides on the appropriate sanction. In rare cases of a student committing near-simultaneous violations of the same type in separate courses, the Chair will determine whether the violations should be counted as a single or separate violations, in line with Policy Section 3.4. The Chair will then send a letter to the student by way of their official Redeemer email with information about the violation, the sanction and the options and deadlines for appeal. The Chair will also inform the instructor about any sanction that affects the student's grade on a particular assignment or overall course.
5. The instructor will then notify the Chair and Registrar that the penalty has been assigned.

Note: Per Policy (Section 3.3.1), the standard penalties for academic dishonesty occurring in a course-related context are:

- First violation: A "0" on the related assessment piece.
- Second violation: An "F" in the course related to the violation.
- Third violation: Expulsion from the university, effective the date of the violation.

Note: The process for appealing the decision or the sanction relating to an academic integrity violation can be found on the App for the internal Redeemer community (at [this link](#)).